



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/919,353	07/31/2001	Barry Hannigan	87264-02521	2757
30734	7590	07/15/2004	EXAMINER	
BAKER + HOSTETLER LLP WASHINGTON SQUARE, SUITE 1100 1050 CONNECTICUT AVE. N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20036-5304			ANYA, CHARLES E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2126	

DATE MAILED: 07/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/919,353

Applicant(s)

HANNIGAN, BARRY

Examiner

Charles E Anya

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 July 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-30 are pending in this application.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 2, 14 and 29 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 2 appears to include a typographical error on line 1. For the purpose of this office action the examiner would insert "1" after "claim".

Claims 14 and 29 appear to include typographical errors on lines 2 and 4 respectively. For the purpose of this office action the examiner would change the phrase "at least one protocol-specific link library" on lines 2 and 4 to "at least one protocol-specific dynamic link library".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-7, 13-20 and 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,612,898 to Huckins.

Art Unit: 2126

5. As to claim 1, Huckins teaches a system for performing multiple protocol analysis (figure 2 Col. 4 Ln. 14 – 65), comprising: at least one protocol-specific dynamic link library to analyze at least one protocol (Protocol Specific Event Handler 216/218/220 Col. 4 Ln. 45 – 49, Col. 5 Ln. 41 – 53) a default dynamic link library to analyze a different protocol that does not correspond to said at least one protocol-specific dynamic link library (figure 3 Col. 4 Ln. 66 – 67, Col. 5 Ln. 1 – 16, Col. 5 Ln. 54 – 60, “...default...” Col. 8 Ln. 34 – 46), and an application program interface (API) managing said at least one protocol-specific dynamic link library and said default dynamic link library to perform multiple protocol analyses (figure 5 (CPLS 520) Col. 5 Ln. 61 – 67, Col. 6 Ln. 1 – 12).

6. As to claim 2, Huckins teaches the system according to claim, wherein analyzing said at least one protocol includes decoding and filtering (Col. 5 Ln. 17 – 32, Col. 6 Ln. 44 – 45).

7. As to claim 3, Huckins teaches the system according to claim 1, wherein said at least one protocols are used for data transport (Block 924 Col. 7 Ln. 12 – 16).

8. As to claim 4, Huckins teaches the system according to claim 1, wherein said application program interface is a dynamic link library (Col. 4 Ln. 50 – 54).

Art Unit: 2126

9. As to claim 5, Huckins teaches the system according to claim 1, further including means for enabling an addition of another protocol-specific dynamic link library to analyze an additional protocol (figures 2/5 Col. 4 Ln. 45 – 49, Col. 5 Ln. 61 – 67).

10. As to claim 6, Huckins teaches the system according to claim 1, wherein an application external from the system and in communication with the system uses said protocol-specific dynamic link library to read a specific protocol, without the application managing or reading the protocol (Col. 4 Ln. 41 – 45).

11. As to claim 7, Huckins teaches the system according to claim 1, wherein the system includes a module applying common screen formatting across different protocols to display results of at least one analysis (Col. 2 Ln. 31 – 42, Col. 5 Ln. 30 – 32).

12. As to claim 13, Huckins teaches the system according to claim 1, wherein the application program interface accepts application-specific formatting processes supplied from an external application, wherein the processes affect decoded output values for selected protocol fields resulting from the protocol analysis by a respective library (figure 2 Col. 4 Ln. 14 – 59, Col. 5 Ln. 16 – 22).

13. As to claim 14, Huckins teaches a method for performing multiple protocol analysis, comprising: providing at least one protocol-specific link library (Protocol

Art Unit: 2126

Specific Event Handler 216/218/220 Col. 4 Ln. 45 – 49, Col. 5 Ln. 41 – 53), providing a default dynamic link library/using one of the dynamic link libraries (figure 3 Col. 4 Ln. 66 – 67, Col. 5 Ln. 1 – 16, Col. 5 Ln. 54 – 60, "...default..." Col. 8 Ln. 34 – 46), analyzing at least one protocol to decode and filter said at least one protocol (Col. 5 Ln. 17 – 32, Col. 6 Ln. 44 – 45) and managing said at least one protocol-specific dynamic link library and said default dynamic link library to perform multiple protocol analyses (figures 2/5 (CPLS 520) Col. 5 Ln. 61 – 67, Col. 6 Ln. 1 – 12).

14. As to claims 15 – 19, see the rejections of claims 2 – 7 respectively.

15. As to claim 20, Huckins teaches the method according to claim 14, further including applying formatting across different protocols to display results of at least one analysis (Col. 2 Ln. 31 – 42).

16. As to claim 26, see the rejection of claim 13.

17. As to claim 27, Huckins teaches an apparatus for performing multiple protocol analysis, comprising: means for determining whether a protocol is a default protocol or a specific protocol (Col. 8 Ln. 34 – 46, Col. 8 Ln. 60 – 67), based on the results of the determination, means for analyzing the protocol by using a default dynamic link library or a protocol-specific dynamic link library (figure 3 Col. 4 Ln. 66 – 67, Col. 5 Ln. 1 – 16, Col. 8 Ln. 34 – 46, Col. 8 Ln. 60 – 67), and means for managing said at least one

protocol-specific dynamic link library and said default dynamic link library to perform multiple protocol analyses (Col. 2 Ln. 14 – 39, figure 5 Col. 5 Ln. 61 – 67, Col. 6 Ln. 1 – 11).

18. As claim 28, huckins teaches an apparatus for performing multiple protocol analysis, comprising: an application program interface to receive a message having network data of a default protocol or a specific protocol and to return a processed representation of the network data (Client Logging Interface 212 Col. 4 Ln. 34 – 59), a default dynamic link library in communication with and managed by the application program interface to receive the network data from the application program interface if the network data is of the default protocol and to process the network data for the application program interface (CPLS 214 Col. 4 Ln. 34 – 59, col. 8 Ln. 34 – 46), and at least one protocol-specific dynamic link library also in communication with the application program interface to receive the network data from the application program interface if the network data is of the specific protocol and to process the network data for the application program interface (figure 2 Col. 4 Ln. 14 – 32).

19. As to claim 29, see the rejection of claim 14 above.

20. As to claim 30, Huckins teaches method for performing multiple protocol analysis, comprising: receiving a protocol decode request having captured network data from an external application (“...request...” Col. 2 Ln. 26 – 30, Col. 5 Ln. 41 – 53, figure

5 Col. 6 Ln. 1 - 11), determining whether the network data requires a given protocol specific library function to decode the network data (figure 5 Col. 6 Ln. 1 – 11, Col. 8 Ln. 34 – 67), if the given protocol specific library function is not available, loading the given protocol specific library function to decode the network data (Col. 8 Ln. 34 – 46) and transmitting a decoded representation of the network data to the external application (Col. 3 Ln. 59 – 61, Col. 2 Ln. 40 – 41, Col. 8 Ln. 40 – 43: NOTE: Although the step of transmitting the decoded representation of the network data to external application is not explicitly taught, the display step of Huckins inherently implies that the client components 51, 512 and 514 would receive and display log events).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

21. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

22. **Claims 8-12 and 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,612,898 to Huckins in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,584,501 to Cartsonis et al.**

23. As to claim 8, Huckins is silent with reference to a system according to claim 7, wherein the results are displayed in a grid having rows and columns.

Art Unit: 2126

24. Cartsonis teaches a system according to claim 7, wherein the results are displayed in a grid having rows and columns (figures 2/3/4/5/6).

25. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Cartsonis and Huckins because the teaching of Cartsonis would improve the system of Huckins by providing user inaction with component displayed on a screen shot (Cartsonis Col. 3 Ln. 58 – 65).

26. As to claim 9, Cartsonis teaches a system according to claim 8, further including a decoded message cache to store the results in the grid for later retrieval (figure 7 Col. 6 Ln. 53 – 67, Col. 7 Ln. 1 – 9).

27. As to claim 10, Cartsonis teaches the system according to claim 9, wherein said decoded message cache receives multiple requests for a subset of results in the grid (figure 5 Col. 6 Ln. 5 – 12, figure 7 Col. 6 Ln. 53 – 67, Col. 7 Ln. 1 – 9).

28. As to claim 11, Cartsonis teaches the system according to claim 1, further comprising at least one dialog display coupled to said application program interface to receive a selection of filtering parameters from a user (Col. 4 Ln. 46 – 52).

29. As to claim 12, Cartsonis teaches the system according to claim 11, wherein said at least one dialog display corresponds to a respective protocol (Col. 4 Ln. 6 – 18).

Art Unit: 2126

30. As to claims 21 – 25, see the rejection of claims 8 – 12 respectively.

Conclusion

31. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

32. U.S. Pat. No. 6,516,355 B1 to Hartmann et al. discloses a generic switch messaging protocol handling and switch supervision including plurality of switching engines.

33. U.S. Pat. No. 5,850,388 to Anderson et al. discloses a protocol analyzer for monitoring digital transmission networks.

34. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles E Anya whose telephone number is (703) 305-3411. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-6:00) First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, An Meng-Ai can be reached on (703) 305-9678. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2126

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Charles E Anya
Examiner
Art Unit 2126

cea.



ST. JOHN COURTENAY III
PRIMARY EXAMINER